

Amendment  
U.S. Serial No.: 10/511,164  
Attorney Docket No. 042563

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace the sheet of drawings with Figure 1 by the replacement sheet which is submitted with this paper, in which reference numeral 4 has been added.

**REMARKS**

By the present amendment, the specification has been corrected to replace “Fig. 2” by “Fig. 1” on page 10, line 10. Also, a typographical error has been corrected on page 6, line 25 (“a light” instead of “an light”).

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to replace “is 0.005 or less” by “satisfies a relationship  $0 < (Ra/Sm) \leq 0.005$ ”

Figure 1 has been amended to add reference numeral 4 for the light diffusion layer.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 are the only independent claim.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to because of the absence of reference numeral “4” mentioned on page 6, line, and the specification is objected to because of the mention of “Fig. 2” instead of “Fig. 1” on page 10, line 10.

A replacement sheet of drawings with reference numeral 4 for the light diffusion layer is submitted with this paper, and the specification has been corrected as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objections should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite, with respect to a lower limit for the ratio  $(Ra/Sm)$  and an upper limit for the average height-depth spacing  $Sm$  in claims 1 and 2.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Of course, it is immediately understood by the person of the art that  $Ra$  (as well as  $Sm$ ) is never exactly zero, so that the ratio  $Ra/Sm$  is never exactly zero. Accordingly, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to

Amendment  
U.S. Serial No.: 10/511,164  
Attorney Docket No. 042563

replace "is 0.005 or less" by "satisfies a relationship  $0 < (Ra/Sm) \leq 0.005$ " without affecting claim scope.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.


In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Nicolas E. Seckel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,373

NES/rep  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 822-1100